

REMARKS

By the amendment, claims 1, 2, 6, 9 and 14-16 have been amended, and claims 3-5, 10-13 and 17 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 6-9 and 14-16 are pending in the present application. Of the pending claims, claims 6-8 and 14-16 have been withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species.

The objection to the disclosure is noted. In response, all of the amendments suggested by the Examiner have been made to the specification. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The objection to the drawings is noted. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's requirement for additional reference labels in the drawings.

With respect to the requirement for labeling "capacitors" Cs1 and Cs2 in Figs. 5-9, 11 and 12, Applicants respectfully point out to the Examiner that in Figs. 5-8, 11 and 12, the frequency shifting capacitors Cs1 and Cs2 are formed by the separated electrodes and the inner conductor of the respective resonance hole so as to generate capacitive coupling between the separated electrode and the inner conductor. In Fig. 9, the frequency shifting capacitors Cs1 and Cs2 are formed by generation of an electrostatic capacitance between the metallic pins (94 and 95) and the inner conductor of the respective resonance holes.

Applicants respectfully submit that one of skill in the art, given the drawing figures and the accompanying description in the specification, would readily recognize that a "capacitor" is not labeled in these Figures because the "capacitor" is actually a capacitive coupling, not an actual piece of hardware. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to page 19, lines 12-24 (Fig. 5); page 21, lines 11-24 (Fig. 6); page 23, lines 16-25 (Fig.

7); page 25, line 21 to page 26, line 5 (Fig. 8); page 27, lines 15-26 (Fig. 9); page 30, lines 20-25 (Fig. 11); and page 33, lines 10-18 (Fig. 12).

With respect to the requirement for providing reference label 12c in Fig. 13, Applicants respectfully point out that Fig. 13 is a cross section of Fig. 12 taken along line XIII-XIII. Reference label 12c corresponds to the upper face of the dielectric block 12. Since Fig. 13 is a cross section, no upper face is included in Fig. 13. Thus, upper face 12c cannot be labeled.

Accordingly, since the present invention is readily understandable by one skilled in the art without the additional reference labels, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the drawings

Claims 1-5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. In response, pending claims 1, 2 and 9 have been amended so as to be in full compliance with all §112 requirements. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 stands rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by either McVeety et al., Yorita et al. (US '674), Hoang or Yamada. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 which were neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a dielectric filter which includes “a voltage controlled reactance element and a circuit element for controlling the reactance element electrically connected between the separated electrode and the ground electrode”, wherein “wherein a center frequency of a passband of the dielectric filter is variable as a result of varying a resonant frequency based on the at least one resonance electrode by varying the capacitance connected to the at least one resonance electrode according to a voltage applied to the voltage controlled reactance element.” With this arrangement, a resonant frequency of the

resonance electrode is variable, and a frequency response of the dielectric filter can be shifted.

Neither McVeety et al., Yorita et al. (US '674), Hoang nor Yamada, either alone or combined, teach or suggest a voltage controlled reactance element and a circuit element for controlling the reactance element electrically connected between the separated electrode and the ground electrode as required by independent claim 1. Accordingly, since each and every element as defined in independent claim 1 is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited references, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Ala-Kojola et al. applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Unlike the dielectric filter defined in independent claim 1, Ala-Kojola et al. discloses a dielectric filter in which a frequency of a passband of the dielectric filter is variable by varying a coupling between two resonators. With the dielectric filter of Ala-Kojola et al., the frequency responses have a mirror image in relation to an assumed axis which is located half way between the transmission band TX' and the reception band RX'. See Fig. 6 and column 6, lines 15-30.

There is nothing within Ala-Kojola et al. which teaches or even remotely suggests a voltage controlled reactance element and a circuit element for controlling the reactance element electrically connected between the separated electrode and the ground electrode such that a resonant frequency of the resonance electrode is variable, as required by independent claim 1. Accordingly, since Ala-Kojola et al. does not teach or suggest each and every limitation and defined in independent claim 1, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by either Yorita (JP 002) or Togami. With the cancellation of claims 2 and 5, this rejection

is deemed moot with respect to those claims. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with respect to claims 1 and 9.

Neither Yorita (JP 002) nor Togami, either alone or combined, teach or suggest a dielectric filter including a voltage controlled reactance element and a circuit element for controlling the reactance element electrically connected between the separate electrode and the ground electrode as required by independent claim 1.

Yorita (JP 002) merely discloses a dielectric filter which includes capacitor patterns on a board. There is no description in Yorita about varying a frequency response. Likewise, Togami only discloses a dielectric filter which includes capacitor patterns and polar patterns on a board, and lacks any description about varying a frequency response.

Accordingly, since each and every element is defined in independent claim 1 is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the art of record.

Claim 9 depends directly from independent claim 1 and includes all the limitation found therein as well as additional limitations which, in combination with the limitation of independent claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record. Accordingly, claim 9 is likewise patentable.

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yorita (JP 002) in view of Ala-Kojola et al. With the cancellation of claims 3 and 4, this rejection is deemed moot.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is generic to all claimed embodiments. Thus, it is respectfully requested that previously withdrawn dependent claims 6-8 and 14-16 be considered and allowed along with independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of the amendments to the specification, favorable consideration of the amendments to claims 1, 2, 6, 9 and 14-16, and allowance of the present application with claims 1, 2, 6-9 and 14-16 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: July 30, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By


Richard LaCava

Registration No.: 41,135

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant